

REMARKS:

After entry of this response, claims 4 to 17, 35 to 58, and 60 to 97 will be pending. Claims 1 to 3 were cancelled in an earlier paper. Claims 18 to 21 and 59, which were withdrawn from consideration in an earlier paper, have been cancelled. Claims 22 to 34 have also been cancelled. Claims 4 and 14 have been amended and claims 60 to 97 have been added herein. Claims 4, 35, 50, 58, 60, 74, 89 and 97 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Section 112 Rejection

Claims 4 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, for alleged indefiniteness. In particular, the Examiner questioned the meaning of the term “using” in claim 4. In response, Applicants have amended claim to 4 remove this term. Amended claim 4 is believed to be entirely definite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the § 112 rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicated that claims 4 to 17 would be allowable if they were rewritten to overcome their rejection under § 112, ¶ 2. Claim 4 has been so amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 35 to 58 are allowable. In the discussion of these claims, the Office Action provided a reason why claim 35

was allowable. The Office Action then went on to state that claims 36 to 58 depend on claim 35.

However, as noted in the previous paper filed in this case, **claim 50 is an independent claim, claims 51 to 57 depend from claim 50, and claim 58 is another independent claim.**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request verification that claims 50 to 58 are allowed in their own right.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 22 to 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over “Raissinia” in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,022 (Dittmar). Applicants have cancelled these claims, rendering this rejection moot.

New Claims

Claims 60 to 97 have been added. These claims recite devices that implement the methods of claims 4 to 17 and 35 to 58. Accordingly, these claims also are believed to be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane C. Butzer

Dated: February 18, 2004

Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700